

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Weshington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
097220.80a	03733795	MODITER	1.	Colombia (1)
			EXAMINER	
#1041 X 3541			2 . n/t.//	Salm I- I
JONAHHYA F			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
500 RORTH	MAL PHORERTY U.S. DWY 45	Z DE PARCINE UI S	7 124 A	17
LIBERTYVII	LE IL 60048	<i>,</i>	DATE MAILED:	せん ジングタ
This is a communication COMMISSIONER OF P.	from the examiner in ATENTS AND TRADE	charge of your application. EMARKS		
		•		
_		Responsive to communication filed on	127/96	
This application has				
A shortened statutory per Fallure to respond within	ariod for response to the the period for respon	nis action is set to expire month(s). se will cause the application to become abando	days fronted. 35 U.S.C. 133	om the date of this letter.
Part I THE FOLLOWI	NG ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:		
1. Notice of Re	ferences Cited by Exa			atent Drawing Review, PTO-948
	Cited by Applicant, P7		tice of Informal Paten	t Application, PTO-152.
5 Information of	on How to Effect Draw	ing Changes, PTO-1474. 6. 🔲		
Part II SUMMARY O				
1. Claims	19-24,26	-31 33 - 38		are pending in the application
	ove, claims		ar	e withdrawn from consideration.
2. Claims		32,39		_ have been cancelled.
3. Claims	<u></u>			
4. 🖸 Claims	19-24,26	-31,33-38		are rejected.
5. Claims				are objected to.
6. Claims			are subject to restrict	ion or election requirement.
7. This application	n has been filed with in	nformal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.95 which ar	o acceptable for exar	nination purposes.
	=	onse to this Office action.		
9. The corrected are accepta	or substitute drawings able;	have been received one (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Pale		C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings PTO-948).
10. The proposed examiner;	additional or substitute disapproved by the ex	e sheet(s) of drawings, filed on raminer (see explanation).	has (have) been	approved by the
11. The proposed	drawing correction, file	nd, has been □ appr	roved; 🗆 disapprove	d (see explanation).
12. Acknowledgem	nent is made of the cla n parent application, se	Im for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certific erial no; filed on	ed copy has Deen	received not been received
13. Since this appl accordance wi	lication apppears to be th the practice under E	In condition for allowance except for formal ma Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	tiers, prosecution as	to the merits is closed in
as Clorker			*	

5

10

15

20

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE

Status of Application.

1. In response to the applicant's amendment received on 12/27/96. The examiner has considered the new presentation of claims and applicant arguments in view of the disclosure and the present state of the prior art. And it is the examiner's position that claims 19-24,26-31,33-38 are unpatentable for the reasons set forth in this office action:

CLAIMS

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as the specification, as originally filed, does not provide support for the invention as now claimed.

Specifically, the claimed definition of a cycle as comprising "a first period when the alert is generated followed by a second period when the alert is not generated," is not support by the specification as originally filed.

3. Claims 19-22,24-27,29-32,34-37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first

5

10

15

20

paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

DOUBLE PATENTING

4. Claims 19,24,29,34 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of non-obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,18,19,20 of U.S. application No. 220949 and claims 19,26,33 of U.S. application No. 220851.

The non-obviousness-type double patenting rejection is a judicially established doctrine based upon public policy and is primarily intended to prevent prolongation of the patent term by prohibiting claims in a second patent not patentably distinct from claims in a first patent. *In re Schneller*, 397 f.2d 350,158 USPQ 210(CCPA 1968). A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(b) would overcome an actual or provisional rejection on this ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.78(d).

A two part test is applied to the claims. 1) is the subject matter recited in the claims of the application fully disclosed in the patent and covered by a claim in the patent. If yes, the second test is 2) is there any reason why applicant was prevented from presenting the same claims for examination in the issued patent (application) if the answer is no a double patenting rejection is appropriate.

Here, the subject matter recited in the pending claim is fully disclosed in the

08/220851 2211

5

10

15

20

applications referred above and covers the same subject matter covered by claims 1,18,19,20 of U.S. application No. 220949 and claims 19,26,33 of U.S. application No. 22085. Further, there was no reason why applicant was prevented from presenting the same claim for examination in the other application. The applicant has not maintained a clear line of demarkation between the above applications. Furthermore, the applicant appears to intend the above applications referring to the same subject matter since all have the same title.

- 5. Claims 21-23,26-28,31-33,36-38 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,18,19,20 of U.S. application No. 220949 and claims 19,26,33 of application No. 220851 in view of Breeden and Ohyanagi as discussed above.
- 6. The obviousness-type double patenting rejection is a judicially established doctrine based upon public policy and is primarily intended to prevent prolongation of the patent term by prohibiting claims in a second patent not patentably distinct from claims in a first patent. *In re Vogel*, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970). A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(b) would overcome an actual or provisional rejection on this ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.78(d).

REMARKS

Response to Arguments.

The following discussion is introduced in direct response to the arguments

08/220851 2211

5

10

15

20

25

presented in the instant amendment:

- 7. The applicant believes that the claimed invention differs from the prior art of record for the following reasons:
 - a. The applicant argues that there is support for the claimed invention.
- 8. Regarding the applicants arguments the examiner points out the following:
- a. The sections of the specification pointed to by the applicant still do not support the invention as now claimed. The claims require the periodic generation of an alert for a predetermined number of cycles. This is supported by the specification. The claims then continue to require that each cycle includes a time when the alert is on and a time when the alert is off. This is not supported by the original specification.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED

08/220851 2211

FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

5

CONTACT INFORMATION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Zimmerman whose telephone number is (703) 305-4796.

10

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4900.

15

20

703-305-4796 March 24, 1997 Brian Zimmerman
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2211

Art Unit 2211